

Date: Sat, 26 Jun 93 04:30:32 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #206
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 26 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 206

Today's Topics:

ARRL EMI/RFI help (was Re: NQOI Case: A Proposal for Action) (2 msgs)
 NQOI: What I would do.
 NQOI Case : HF Vertical Antennas
 NQOI Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
 Presence of control operator (3 msgs)
 Remote Controlled Amp Was:Re:PresofContOp

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1993 14:20:45 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntp2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: ARRL EMI/RFI help (was Re: NQOI Case: A Proposal for Action)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

stevew@netcom.com (Steven Wilson) writes:

>in lies most of the secret. It does help to have an outside group come
>in and work with BOTH parties to resolve the problem.

I suspect that you are correct, but outside groups aren't always available.
I've searched and yet to come up with one in my area (northwest suburbs of
Chicago).

Also, sometimes outside assistance just makes a complete mess of things.
In my case, my neighbor spoke to the daughter of a "helpful" ham who said
that the fix for his television interference problem was easy, just tell

the ham (me) to install a filter. When I tried to explain to my neighbor that the sort of filter (low pass) that was suggested to him wasn't applicable in this case (2 meter SSB being rectified in the audio section of the TV), he got angry and hung up on me. I don't think I've ever recovered from that "helpful" ham. It's also possible that the situation was unsolvable in the first case as this guy's wife made it a point of telling me everytime she saw me that she got up every morning and cursed the previous owners of our house because they put up a fence. Upon reflection, I can imagine what she thought of my antennas!

>Who does one write to request the FCC to take a more agressive stance on
>EMI problems?

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1993 17:04:13 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ncar!
elmore@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ARRL EMI/RFI help (was Re: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun25.122030.23973@nntp2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>Also, sometimes outside assistance just makes a complete mess of things.
>In my case, my neighbor spoke to the daughter of a "helpful" ham who said
>that the fix for his television interference problem was easy, just tell
>the ham (me) to install a filter. When I tried to explain to my neighbor
>that the sort of filter (low pass) that was suggested to him wasn't
>applicable in this case (2 meter SSB being rectified in the audio section
>of the TV), he got angry and hung up on me.

...stuff deleted

>Who does one write to request the FCC to take a more agressive stance on
>EMI problems?

The FCC no longer investigates RFI complaints due to Amateur radio interference. They will send material to the complainant, but (at least at the Denver Field Office) they take the tack that amateur equipment is almost always clean and the problem resides in the device being interfered with.

As the "Technical Coordinator" here in Colorado, I'm trying to

build a cadre of people (Technical Specialists) to help hams with just this problem. Maybe I'm lucky, but I've forged an excellent working relationship with the FCC Denver Field Office. So far, I have maybe 8 or 9 TSs, but I want enough to cover the state relatively well in pairs. To make sure everyone is on the same wavelength, I'm planning trainings *with the FCC* in technical matters (they will loan us some equipment if we need it!) as well as conflict resolution techniques.

I'm one of the few who think that RFI is a serious issue hams must deal with (I also think we should be allowed antennas taller than 35 ft, but that's another thread). In almost every case I've seen, it's more a conflict resolution problem than a technical one. Once everyone settles down and stops yelling, the solution is relatively straightforward, though in some cases a surprising amount of time needs to be expended to track down just what the problem is.

Try contacting the Technical Coordinator in your area (he's listed on the front boilerplate in QST). He (or she) might be able to help you out. You need not be a League member to get help, and it doesn't even help. When I'm called, I have no idea whether or not the ham is a League member and couldn't care less.

Kim Elmore, [N50P, PP ASEL/Glider 2232456]

* -.- -.- -.- -.- Said by NQ0I while working on his shack:
* "All these *wires!* Why do they call it 'wireless'!?" *
* -.- -.- -.- -.-

Date: 25 Jun 93 12:30:15 CDT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!raistlin!
timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!dadams@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQOI: What I would do.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article Cx@cbnewsk.cb.att.com, h8afd@cbnewsk.cb.att.com (carl.h.bohman..jr) writes:

|With respect to the 35 foot mound of dirt, why stop at
|35 feet?

Well I suppose there is only so much you can heap up on one acre. ;^)
I don't know what height it would be. (Just tell em it is a compost
heap. ;^)

David, N0WWN

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com
-Sourdough and Ham- - Minnesotans for Global Warming! -
(&gardner)

Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1993 12:53:01 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!theporch!
jackatak!root@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQOI Case : HF Vertical Antennas
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
> In article <1993Jun21.172236.28357@ncar.ucar.edu> elmore@rap.ucar.edu (Kim El
> > Full-sized 40 m vertical dipoles are 66' tall, give or take a
>
> Fortunately, however, optimal TOA increases with increasing wavelength, so
> things are far less critical than at 20m. So, go ahead and center inductive
> load the dipoles for the low bands.

Another CC&R heard from:

I live in a subdivision with everything underground...electric,
telephone, cableTV...save the houses. Cars can not be parked in the
street, no business use allowed, no cars on blocks...all the "usuals"

We moved here, willingly, because the neighborhood is the best
available to raise my kids (becoming moot, as my eldest still-at-home
has just graduated from high school and is headed to college in the
fall, though the 11-year-old remains with us) and affords my wife a
wonderful neighborhood to live in. There are lots of competing
interests in our household (as there should be in a healthy and
vibrant, alive system) and my wife is a General Class Amateur (N4AFG)
and damn-site better CW op than me!

The previous QTH sported a 120' tower with 20/15/10 at 120' and 40
(2-element) at 128' with a 250' center-fed Zepp (open wire of course! ;^)
for 160/80/75/40/30 and whatever.

We chose a different equation for "quality of life" for the entire
FAMILY in our present location...which allows NO outside antennas
according to the CC&R.

HOWEVER, I have had 40' of Rohn 25 leaning against the house since
moving day, and the base was gradually moved in and planted. No
problems yet. There has been a partially assembled Quad (2-el GEM) on
the roof for about 4 1/2 years. No problems yet. There are plans afoot
to install a center-fed Zepp in the trees in back (coated wire and

coated ladder-line...but compromises are a fact of modern life) and I may get help in trimming the trees that have preventing installing the Quad (at 6'4" and 265 -- ex interior lineman -- I can not safely climb the trees, and conventional ladder approaches are blocked and I am not willing to hire a large truck or tree cutter who would be too obvious to my neighbors, who might then object to it all...)

My solution? I operate HF mobile. I have a HUGE antenna: Texas Bug Catcher (Henry Allen version) with heavy everything: 4 1/2 feet from base to coil; biggest coil Henry makes; 30" diameter capacity hat; 8' stainless whip for the "stinger". I do not crack pileups with brute strength. And, I don't give a damn! I prefer to employ skill: I can run my voice well up into the tenor/YL range, I frequently squeel "mobile" (and Yes, Virginia, most DX will try to work the QRP and mobile, because they appreciate the handicap system and find shooting fish in a barrel -- the 2KW to stacked monobanders approach of the weaker minds and lazier souls -- not as much *fun*! ;^) and I am patient. I listen a great deal, and I know, after 37 years of hamming that there is ALWAYS another day and another chance.

That said, I have worked another DXCC mobile in a short time. I have found the additional challenge of having to match my operating proficiency and wits to the conditions and situation more rewarding than just hammering contacts out through a net with a policeman to direct traffic and tell me when I have a contact -- like I would not have any idea whether I did it or not -- or killing mosquitos with an Atomic Cannon...

Listen around 14.200 for KA0FZC (I think that is Jon's call) who drives a mail truck from Fargo to Minot, ND or someplace like that every day. He runs a short BugCatcher up the BACK of the cab of his truck, surrounded by metal everywhere. His stinger is short to get under the 13'6" height limit (and you Colorado lads thought YOU had it tough! ;^) and he uses a solid-state kilowatt to help. He is L-O-U-D!! Very. Works whoever and whatever he can hear.

I am begining to think those posting that say the demise of the huge tower and stacked arrays, save for contest stations and the special ones that survive and are passed on...is not so much of a loss. What is the need for DXCC in a weekend? So what if it takes longer? And, I think some of the emergency arguements are a tad empty, since the huge tower and stacked monobanders may not stay up if "The Big One" hits, anyway. Then, it's Field Day and makeshift for all, and on even footing, you'd be amazed how much fun you can have.

Apologies to the VHF/UHF weak signal chaps who can't use the mobile and vertical solutions as well to chase their joy. I feel badly for them, but having worked DXCC crystal-controlled with 40 watts as a

Novice, (it takes patience and skill as much as power and bux) I don't have much sympathy for the gotta make Honor Roll in 36 hours mindset.

Whew! That feels much better!

73

Jack

+-----+
Jack GF Hill	Voice: (615) 459-2636 - Ham Call: W4PPT
P. O. Box 1685	Modem: (615) 377-5980 - Bicycling and SCUBA Diving
Brentwood, TN 37024	Fax: (615) 459-0038 - Life Member - ARRL
root@jackatak.raider.net - "Plus ca chnagez, plus ca la meme chose"	
+-----+

Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1993 14:08:24 GMT

From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: NQOI Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

stevew@netcom.com (Steven Wilson) writes:

>
> delete for purposes of brevity
>

So Steve, what do you suggest? That each and everyone of us that lives in a town with unreasonably restrictive zoning laws take the town to court? Hmm at N thousand towns at \$25,000 per suit that's a pretty big number.

I'm not sure what the perfect solution is, but giving out suggestions and pointing hams to volunteer counsels (what a misnomer) is certainly less than optimal. Perhaps I'm alone in this situation and the vast majority of the ARRL members are happy with their zoning restrictions. I don't believe that, but I don't know anyone that has any figures to validate either view.

I guess I also see a lot of interest (heat?) generated over something I personally feel is trivial by comparison in the HF forwarding wars, and I think to myself, if that much time, energy, and money can be spent on such a small issue, then where's the beef with respect to antenna restrictions.

Perhaps this is all related to something I was recently told by Ed Hare. He says they have only received 30 RFI report forms back, so the logical conclusion is that RFI isn't a problem (not that Ed believes that, but where is the proof to the contrary.) Yet I know few if any hams I've talked to that haven't experienced some form of RFI problem. I suspect the others live in blissful ignorance. Extrapolating that out to the general

amateur population yields tens or hundreds of thousands cases.

We just don't have a clue as to how prevalent these problems are.

The ARRL and the amateur community fought the 220 loss in a big way. It was certainly fought based upon principal, not based upon the number of amateurs it affected. So are numbers really important?

Like I said, I'm not sure what the best approach is to fight this encroachment upon our hobby, but I guess I'd sure like to see some more focus placed on it. On a personal level I have started a letter writing campaign to the legislature, but being just one constituent I don't suspect I'll see miracles.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1993 16:18:09 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.bbn.com!petra!
popovich@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Presence of control operator
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Yes, the non-extra is considered a third party. That means no contacts >with DX countries that the US doesn't have a third-party agreement with.
>The control operator must be present and monitoring the transmissions.
>For our group, the control operator usually acts as the logger -- that
>should easily meet the FCC requirements, since the logger is intimately
>aware of everything that is going on.

So how does this work for stations in gigantic FD categories like 15A, operating with a single call sign? The Extra can't be at every operating position, monitoring and controlling every transmission. It seems that either this makes multi-transmitter contest stations illegal, or we're missing something here.

-Steve

Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1993 18:49:11 GMT
From: swrinde@gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!news.cso.uiuc.edu!
freeman@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Presence of control operator
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Steve Popovich (popovich@cyclades.ma30.bull.com) wrote:

> >Yes, the non-extra is considered a third party. That means no contacts
> >with DX countries that the US doesn't have a third-party agreement with.
> >The control operator must be present and monitoring the transmissions.
> >For our group, the control operator usually acts as the logger -- that
> >should easily meet the FCC requirements, since the logger is intimately
> >aware of everything that is going on.
>
> So how does this work for stations in gigantic FD categories like 15A,
> operating with a single call sign? The Extra can't be at every
> operating position, monitoring and controlling every transmission. It
> seems that either this makes multi-transmitter contest stations
> illegal, or we're missing something here.
> -Steve

No, it means that each op has to stay within his or her license's privileges,
unless* a higher class licensee sits down with them as control op.

73,
Jay

Date: 25 Jun 1993 22:06:37 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!mcduffle@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Presence of control operator
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

freeman@eagle.sangamon.edu (Jay Freeman) writes:

>Steve Popovich (popovich@cyclades.ma30.bull.com) wrote:
>> >Yes, the non-extra is considered a third party. That means no contacts
>> >with DX countries that the US doesn't have a third-party agreement with.
>> >The control operator must be present and monitoring the transmissions.
>> >For our group, the control operator usually acts as the logger -- that
>> >should easily meet the FCC requirements, since the logger is intimately
>> >aware of everything that is going on.
>>
>> So how does this work for stations in gigantic FD categories like 15A,
>> operating with a single call sign? The Extra can't be at every
>> operating position, monitoring and controlling every transmission. It
>> seems that either this makes multi-transmitter contest stations
>> illegal, or we're missing something here.
>> -Steve

>No, it means that each op has to stay within his or her license's privileges,
>>unless* a higher class licensee sits down with them as control op.

>73,
>Jay

The League better get the word out then...because every club I have ever been to FD with let even novices operate any mode, any freq, saying it was legal because the extra class op was on the premises. He may have been asleep, at another operating position, or filling the generator. But he was considered there. Most clubs seem to operate under the blanket of one license, letting all positions have the highest privileges.

73, Gary

Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1993 14:35:46 GMT
From: yuma!galen@purdue.edu
Subject: Remote Controlled Amp Was:Re:PresofContOp
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <20csu2INNdfa@topaz.bds.com> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:
>(I have seen that
>JRC now has a linear amplifier with a wireless remote, the utility of
>this escapes me).

Maybe so you can put it across the room so the EM field strength where you happen to be sitting will be less than it would be if the amp was three feet in front of you. You could buy an IR remote extender and put the amp far away from the operating position. No medical consensus exists regarding the effects of strong EM fields, but that's what they said about nuclear radiation at one time.

Just mentioning the possibilities,
Galen Watts, KF0YJ
I built my own 6m transverter!

Date: 25 Jun 1993 17:17:12 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun24.180452.24730@nntp2.cxo.dec.com>,
<C95CCo.I8D@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>,
<POPOVICH.93Jun25111809@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>ds.
Subject : Re: Presence of control operator

> So how does this work for stations in gigantic FD categories like 15A,
> operating with a single call sign? The Extra can't be at every
> operating position, monitoring and controlling every transmission. It
> seems that either this makes multi-transmitter contest stations
> illegal, or we're missing something here.

It's not THE control operator, it's A control operator. Say I operate a 10A (I can't figure out what bands they operate 15 transmitters on) station under my call (W02L). I don't even have to be there. What is required to be there is a control operator at the control point of each station with an appropriate license class for the operation. There can be a novice working on 21.121, a general working on 28.550 and an unlicensed ham accompanied by an Extra class control operator working 14.165.

There's a distinction between a STATION and an OPERATOR. A STATION has a call, the OPERATOR is a person. There's just a one-to-one correspondence in most ham operations, but you need not do it that way. If I go up to the league and use the guest positions at W1AW for some QSO's, who is the control operator. Not W1AW, he's dead. Not some ARRL employee, it would be illegal for them do so. Nope, it's W02L.

-Ron

Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1993 16:13:00 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!asuvax!ennews!anasaz!misty!john@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C90suq.18z@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>, <randall.740849440@woof>, <C956Gz.2r@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>
Subject : Re: First Amendment and NQ0I was Re: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:
n8afd@cbnewsk.cb.att.com (carl.h.bohman..jr) writes:

]Ok, lets say that I am a developer and I am going to develop
]a model community that reflects the cross section of Americans.

]I have the standard CCRs about antenna and stuff and I now add
]a section that says only 80% of the home buyers can be white,
]12% of the home buyers have to be black, 7% of the home buyers
]have to be hispanic and 1% have to be of other ethnic backgrounds.
]How long would that contract stand in a court of law, after all
]all parties willingly signed the contract. What makes ham any
]different with respect to their rights?

The difference is that such a contract is illegal (it violates the Civil Rights Act). Illegal contracts are unenforceable. But, let the Clinton

gang run things a little longer, and it will probably be illegal to NOT include racial quotas.

But I digress....

The contract doesn't keep you from exercising your right to free speech. It simply bans a particular method of exercising it. That is a major difference.

--

John Moore NJ7E, 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 (602-951-9326)
john@anasazi.com ncar!noao!asuvax!anasaz!john anasaz!john@asuvax.eas.asu.edu
- - If a field of study has the word "science" in it - it isn't a science - -
- - Support ALL of the bill of rights, INCLUDING the 2nd amendment! - -

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #206
